



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/605,881	06/29/2000	Christian Laroque	Q59841	7314

7590 02/25/2004

Sughrue Mion Zinn MacPeak & Seas PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue N W
Washington, DC 20037-3213

EXAMINER

STEVENS, ROBERTA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2665	

DATE MAILED: 02/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/605,881

Applicant(s)

LAROQUE ET AL.

Examiner

Roberta A Stevens

Art Unit

2665

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamami (U.S. 6182193 B1) in view of Li (U.S. 6195714 B1).
3. Regarding claim 1, Hamami teaches (column 2, line 50 – column 3, line 62) a method of monitoring the use of a chargeable dynamic signaling port of a trunk connecting two exchanges, in particular in connection with applications which communicate via exchange and which are likely to require to use such ports, in which method, there is provision for assigning rights of use to each application enabling it to have a port of this kind if it has already been set up (column 4, lines 13-33).
4. Hamami does not teach a provision for assigning rights of use to each application enabling it to have a port of this kind set up and then to use it.
5. Li teaches (figure 3) a provision for assigning rights of use to each application enabling it to have a port of this kind set up and then to use it. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art to adapt to Hamami's system Li's concept of having a port of this kind set up and then using it to avoid any error in the system when a port has for application has not been already set up (column 8, line 8 – column 9, line 9).

Art Unit: 2665

6. Regarding claim 2, Li teaches (column 8, line 8 – column 9, line 9) provision for immediately informing applications likely to require to use a changeable dynamic signaling port that a port of this kind has been set up to enable the application to use the port.

7. Regarding claim 3, Hamami teaches (column 2, line 50 – column 3, line 62) wherein the right assigned to an application is monitored (maintaining a in the exchange initiating a call request to set up a call via a chargeable dynamic signaling port of this kind and the same application possibly has a different right according to the exchange from which the setting up a call is initiated.

8. Regarding claim 5, Hamami teaches (column 2, line 50 – column 3, line 62) the rights assigned to each application is stored in a database (routing table) for the exchange initiating the call request.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamami in view of Li and further in view of Brunson (U.S. 5311576).

11. As mentioned above Hamami and Li teaches all of the limitations of claim 1.

12. Hamami nor Li teach a provision for assigning rights of use in time periods that can be changed.

Art Unit: 2665

13. Brunsen teaches (figure 1) teach a provision for assigning rights of use in time periods that can be changed (column 3, lines 58-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adapt to Hamami and Li's system, Brunsen's concept of assigning time to the use of ports to avoid delay in the system..

Conclusion

14. Any inquiry concerning the communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roberta Stevens whose telephone number is (703) 308-6607. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:00 am to 5:30 p.m.

15. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor can be reached on (703) 308-6602.

16. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

17. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to: (703) 872-9306

For informal draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA. Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Roberta A. Stevens
Patent Examiner
02-23-04



STEVEN H. D NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER